



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

not to "foundation" or "origination." A quite transparent case of Mr. Hearn's error is where (p. 152) he attributes the exceptional cleanliness of the Japanese to their religion, which here, as usual, he sums up as ancestor-worship. One wonders, however, why this world-wide phenomenon of religion should determine a Japanese cleanliness; why ancestor-worshippers are not always clean, as for example the Chinese, who bathe most rarely. It seems saner to seek a cause for the unique daily bath of the Japanese in their also uniquely numerous thermal springs, which occur in no less than 388 different localities. Symbolism did indeed, in Japan as elsewhere, lead to religious bathing in rivers; but bathing in rivers, as in ocean, was never popular in Japan until recently learned from the foreigner, whereas the thermal springs are crowded, and the daily baths at home are always taken exceedingly hot after the thermal pattern, for these have been found not only cleansing, but curing and warming, the last quality being a great merit where winters are cold and houses unheated.

Finally, the reader need not expect to meet here any adequate reference to those vices that have been fostered by religion in Japan. The concubinage, confirmed by ancestorism, is once mentioned; and the harlotry, promoted by phallicism (the phallos was frequently found in a brothel, though not exclusively there, of course), is relegated to a single footnote. But such matters can be learned elsewhere, whereas the close and frequent points of influence which religion exercised upon politics and morality in Japan can nowhere else be so well studied as here.

EDMUND BUCKLEY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

L'anarchie et le collectivisme. By ALFRED NAQUET. Paris: E. Sansot, 1904. Pp. 250. Fr. 3.50.

We need not present the author, his name being known throughout the world as that of a great politician, a learned chemist, and a profound philosopher. The name alone makes us anticipate a notable work. And so, indeed, it is. It has never been our fortune to read a more earnest, a deeper, or a more moderate as well as sympathetic criticism of anarchism, or, rather, of anarchistic communism.

M. Naquet has undertaken to examine and criticise the doctrine of anarchistic communism, comparing it with the doctrine of col-

lectivism. In this he has succeeded well. The present work, before appearing as a volume, was published in *L'humanité nouvelle*. To M. Naquet anarchism is really the same as anarchistic communism, and the only doctrine of anarchistic communism is that presented by Kropotkin in *Words of a Rebel* and *The Conquest of Bread*. This is the only doctrine which he discusses, and in doing so he draws up a criticism of the teachings of Elisée Reclus and Jean Grave, who are disciples of the Russian anarchist. To this we shall object that the author either was ignorant of, or wilfully passed over in silence, the fact that anarchism is not anarchistic communism. Anarchism is a doctrine, the essence of which is the absence of authority, of government. It lies along the politico-moral line. Anarchistic communism is only a variety of this doctrine. It is a combination of the communistic doctrine — a variety of socialism, which displays itself in the economic line — with the anarchistic doctrine. Thus there may be anarchists who are not communists; and, in fact, there are many such. We shall only mention Tucker's disciples. The title of the book is therefore wrong. It ought to have been *Le communisme anarchique et le collectivisme autoritaire*. The qualificative *autoritaire* is necessary, because there exists an anarchistic collectivism, as may be ascertained by reading the Spanish doctrinal pamphlets.

We must further observe that anarchistic communism has other doctrinal representatives than Kropotkin. Many are those who have published pamphlets advocating an anarchistic-communistic system different from that proposed by Kropotkin. Among others may be mentioned: Enrico Malatesta, Ricardo Mella, Clemens, Parsons, and Dyer D. Lum. If M. Naquet had examined the doctrines of these writers, some of the criticisms which he makes would never have been written.

These reservations aside — and the high value of M. Naquet's book demanded them — we consider his work a monument to doctrinal criticism. The author shows his sympathy for anarchistic communism. It stands for him as a very beautiful ideal. Nevertheless, no adversary of anarchistic communism has ever published such a severe criticism, or shown in such a precise and irrefutable way that it represents a social system which is impossible of realization as long as human nature remains what it is.

The book contains fifteen chapters. First of all, the analogies and differences between collectivism and anarchism are examined. In this first chapter we see that, in the author's opinion, anarchism is

a social system without any sort of organization (p. 14). This is a mistake, hardly to be accounted for in M. Naquet. To admit the accuracy of that assertion, we must admit that absence of authority and government necessarily implies absence of organization. But such is not the case. This supposition is a gratuitous one and cannot be demonstrated. Moreover, many passages in the anarchistic literature assert the existence of "organization" in the anarchistic society. Kropotkin and Jean Grave themselves presuppose such an existence, though it is not formally expressed, as it is, for instance, in Malatesta's pamphlets. Chap. 2 treats of "La prise au tas" and production. Its argumentation seems irrefutable. Not so chap. 3, dealing with "Les réserves" — that is, the capital reserved by the capitalists to be productive — in which we find a slight contradiction. M. Naquet says in substance (p. 42): If a capitalist reserves three-fourths or half of the benefits he reaps, he cannot be accused of having appropriated to himself the whole of the benefits, but only the part which was not reserved. And on p. 44 the author writes: "But the sums saved by the holders of capital, no matter whether they are spent or not, are no less taken away by them from the producers." These two assertions evidently contradict each other, and we wonder why. The fact is that M. Naquet did not intend the first assertion to maintain his argument. Apart from this contradiction, the chapter throughout is very clever. The same may be said of chap. 4, "Répartition communiste;" chap. 5, "Les échanges;" and chap. 6, "Répartition collectiviste." Chap. 7 is devoted to the study of luxury, science, and art in anarchism. After the criticism of the merciless logician, there is hardly anything left of Kropotkin's conceptions. We shall only point out a mistake in the statement on p. 120, where he says: "And since nowadays we judge men according to the results of their acts, and no longer according to some metaphysical rule, after the manner of religions; and since, while glorifying the altruist because of his kind action, and condemning the murderer because of his disastrous act, we proclaim with Littré that both are obeying equally irresistible impulses, we are obliged, by virtue of the same logic, to place the man of science and the artist above the drunkard." M. Naquet is — with reason — a convinced determinist. He therefore contradicts himself when he places the scientist and the artist above the drunkard. Both are philosophically irresponsible for their acts. In consequence, there is no inferiority or superiority of one relative to the other. The acts of the savant are

better and more useful than those of the drunkard—that is all. As determinists, we must judge the deeds and not the doers, who, all conditions being given, could not help doing them. “La division du travail” and “Évolution et révolution” are the subjects of chaps. 8 and 9. In chap. 10 the communalistic form of the revolution, which seems dear to Kropotkin, is examined. The territorial federation does not seem desirable to M. Naquet, as he is inclined to consider it a regression. He believes in a future federation of the groups of producers all over the world, these groups being divided into a multitude of subgroups (pp. 158, 159). M. Naquet is at the same time right and wrong. He is right in believing in a federation of the groups of producers. He is wrong in considering the territorial federation as a regression. Both things will happen: on the economic side, grouping of the producers and federation of the groups; on the political side, grouping of the individuals in territorial units, which we may call communes, and federation of these groups. We say that both things will take place, because already in our actual societies we see the embryo of the two phenomena. The workers of the same territorial unit, of the same commune, will syndicate in distinct corporative groups. On the one hand, these groups combine in the commune to form what is called in France the *bourses de travail*, which form regional federations and also unite in the nation to form the “Fédération nationale des bourses de travail de France.” On the other hand, the corporative groups of the same profession unite in the region and in the nation, and the national federations thus formed group themselves, according to professions, in the “Fédération internationale.” This is the case at least with a few professions, as miners, dock laborers, glove-makers. We see that even in the federations developed on the economic line the starting-point is the commune, or the territorial unit. Simple reflection will show that the federation of those territorial units—that is, of the citizens living in those communes—will be forced upon them, because the neighboring communes have common interests, more or less independent of other and more distant groups. M. Naquet therefore is mistaken in seeing a regression in the territorial federations. Apart from this, his criticism of Kropotkin’s ideas is extremely just. The “Principe d’autorité dans l’anarchie” is examined in chaps. 11–13. On this subject the author concludes his remarks with these words: “In *Words of a Rebel* and *The Conquest of Bread* Kropotkin, the man of science, has given place to the novelist.” This is a severe, but appro-

priate, conclusion. In chap. 14 the author examines the principle of population in the communistic society, which is a subject hardly touched upon by Kropotkin. His conclusion is clearly in favor of collectivism. The ideal is the anarchistic communism, but it is an ideal which will never be reached—so he says—not even in a theoretical infinite. We fully agree with this conclusion.

A. AND H. HAMON.

The Principles of Relief. By EDWARD T. DEVINE, PH.D., LL.D.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904. Pp. 495.

One of the most competent leaders of intelligent philanthropy, a man with the highest academic equipment at the basis of a long, varied, and successful career in the administration of the Charity Organization Society of New York city, has done well to give to the public the ripe results of his reflections. While a certain amount of repetition of thoughts already published was inevitable in a systematic treatise, every chapter and paragraph has its justification. In Part I (pp. 1-181) there is a strong, clear, logical presentation of the essential "principles of relief," and it is here that we come in contact with the matured conclusions of a mind trained in modern scientific method as well as in the varied experiences of practical labors. The fundamental and most fruitful idea of this discussion is that there is a normal standard of living which can be known and approximately measured, and that all relief work is to be judged by its success in aiding social debtors to find their place in a normal and well-balanced life. Most citizens are able to attain this standard without special help from charity, but many others would either perish or become degraded without such assistance.

Following the clear statement of this central thought is a sane and convincing analysis of the regulative principles which should guide charitable persons and associations in their work. The groups of special problems are treated under the heads: elimination of disease, the housing problem, relief of families in homes, breaking up of families, dependent children, dependent adults, family desertion, intemperance, industrial displacement, immigration, discrimination in relief.

In Part II (pp. 185-266) is printed a most interesting and instructive collection of typical relief problems, taken mainly from cases recorded in the Registration Bureau of the New York Charity